

Colusa Subreach Planning Project Advisory Workgroup

Meeting Summary

January 3, 2005 – Colusa County Farm Bureau

Summary prepared by Carolyn Penny, Facilitator, Common Ground: Center for Cooperative Solutions with assistance from Ellen Gentry, Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum

Present:

AW: Don Anderson, Burt Bundy, Ben Carter, Woody Elliott, Michael Fehling, Rebecca Fris, Francis Hickie, Ray Krause, Ryan Luster, Kelly Moroney, Dan Obermeyer, John Rogers, Jeff Sutton, Tom Varga, Ron Withrow, Jon Wrysinski, and Dawit Zeleke.
 Staff: Facilitator Carolyn Penny, Project Manager Gregg Werner, Greg Golet (TNC)
 Guests: Beverly Anderson-Abbs, Michelle Baker (Common Ground), Ellen Gentry (SRCAF), and Dee Ohliger.

Agenda:

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Approximate Start Time</u>	<u>Lead Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
1.	10:00	Carolyn Penny, Facilitator	Welcome and Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions. Approve agenda.
2.	10:10	Gregg Werner, TNC	Overview of Project Components and Work Schedule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn how components fit and opportunities to shape them.
3.	10:20	Gregg Werner, All	Discussion of Specific Restoration Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify questions and concerns to inform baseline analyses and other research topics.
	10:30	All	Survey Check-In	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirmation of survey logistics and content.
	10:40	All	Discussion of Specific Restoration Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared understanding of concerns and issues for the various restoration sites.
4.	11:50	All	Lunch and Break	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No longer hungry.
	12:10	Public	Public Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receive comment from public.
5.	12:20	Gregg Werner, All	Overview of Upcoming Public Engagement Events – Who, Why, Where, What, When <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January Newsletter • February Public Meeting • March Workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise on topics, timing, focus, locations, publicity and other logistical matters.
6.	12:40	Gregg Werner	Orientation to Upcoming Subreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand purposes of

Colusa Subreach Planning Project Advisory Workgroup Draft Meeting Summary 1.3.05

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Approximate Start Time</u>	<u>Lead Person</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
			Background Report and Cultural Resources Report	reports, anticipate distribution, and understand role for AW.
7.	12.50	Carolyn Penny, All	February Agenda and Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shape February agenda and articulate interim steps.
8.	1:00	Carolyn Penny	Adjourn	

Agenda Review and Introductions:

Jeff Sutton requested that the December meeting summary reflect substance of dialogue with conflicts front and center, particularly frustration reflected in the phone survey and allocation of resources discussions. Dan Obermeyer said not all members experienced frustration with the phone survey, and once the purpose of the survey was clarified as a preevaluation tool, no further edits were necessary. The question was raised whether these were meeting summaries or minutes of meetings. It was clarified that they are meeting notes with summaries of comments. Minutes would be too lengthy and not very productive. Carolyn agreed to revise and resubmit the December meeting summary before the February meeting.

Overview of Project Components and Work Schedule:

Gregg presented a one page summary and graph explaining the Advisory Workgroup (AW) role: Determine Topic (within CALFED grant project), Review Scope, Review Report and Utilize Information. The initial landowner survey will begin soon (see Component Project Summary – 1-3-05) to provide information from landowners to the AW and how informed they are. Baseline assessments (by and large technical projects) started last summer, before the AW came together. No policy is needed for information report. Cultural Resources involves reviewing restoration sites for archaeological resources. Tract-specific baseline assessments involve the development of data to support the planning of restoration planting. Tract-specific baseline assessments also include collecting small mammal data for use in this project and restoration in general, sampling a variety of sites regarding density of pest animals during two wet seasons and two dry seasons. Topographic mapping using Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) technology will also be developed for planning and evaluation of restoration. Modeling of the floodplain and hydraulic analysis is required by the Reclamation Board. The AW will review the analysis with final results in 2006. Other focal area plans will be directed as AW determines, within the context of CALFED.

On the TAC agenda (tomorrow) is the Colusa Boat Ramp. Burt asked AW if they want that presentation at next meeting, suggesting it might give information on what can be done on the whole reach depending on CALFED flexibility. Jon Wrynski thought it would be more beneficial to that group rather than this and/or summarized to this group

as an informational item on next agenda. The AW recommended that, if a choice has to be made regarding presentations on the boat ramp study, the preference is for the ad hoc Colusa Committee to receive the presentation, not the AW. The AW agreed to put the Colusa Boat Ramp study on its February agenda as an informational topic.

There were several questions regarding baseline assessments, site planting, and existing situation of species. Gregg offered to put together a summary of those. The group noted that geomorphology is not specifically included in the baseline hydrology analysis and that it would like to see it listed in the scope of work. The AW also would like to make sure threatened and endangered species are evaluated before restoration begins so progress can be measured.

Ben commented that agencies and landowners are concerned with third party impacts, having agencies come onto their property, and if possible to do an inventory on public land and extrapolate on private land (i.e., satellite imaging) for a broader assessment. Gregg said that is not a part of the components, but Dawit suggested listing it as a potential landowner question project. TNC has addressed remote sensing for the entire project area and mapped habitat to look at change and ID how the landscape might yield x number of species and project overall assessments of what is out there to date. Comprehensive assessment has not been done. The focus has more narrowly been on ground studies. It was recommended that the scope be reviewed so that the AW can fashion strategies with a qualitative, information base; knowing information gathered from this project can be used for other projects as well.

Survey Check-In:

Ben received feedback from the last meeting regarding the revised landowner survey. He reported the Steering Committee discussed those concerns. As a result the survey has been revised and sent out. Jeff questioned why the changes of TNC questions were acceptable. Rebecca responded there was no problem removing the questions, that the survey as a whole was instrumental for CALFED. Jeff expressed concern that the issues affect people not along the river and yet the survey is limited to subjects within and adjoining the river. There was concern about the lack of quantitative analysis of species. Greg Golet assured the AW there is data available, and mapping has shown 95% of habitat lost. Burt recommended Stacy Cepello to talk to the group regarding the extensive GIS information.

Discussion of Specific Restoration Sites:

A map showing eight restoration tracts was handed out. Four of these sites were discussed:

- Womble, south of Princeton, in option to TNC with consent of property owner, is primarily riparian. Restoration area is north side. Property is lowest adjoining levy, in Colusa and Glenn counties. 307 acres; 256 acres dense riparian habitat, 51 acres restoration site (annual row crops).

Colusa Subreach Planning Project Advisory Workgroup Draft Meeting Summary 1.3.05

- Jensen Tract, southwest from Womble is owned by TNC, with 105 acres; 83 acres restoration, 22 acres riparian.
- Stegeman, 69 total acres, 59 acres natural riparian, 10 acres restoration site (abandoned walnut orchard). F&G and privately owned.
- 1000 Acre Ranch, owned by TNC, is 60 total acres, 10 acres under levee, with some talk about attractiveness for public use, with parking on adjacent acreage owned by Woodford Yerxa.

Discussion ensued regarding restoration cost, existing restored sites, concern for buffers, evaluation of access, and evaluation of long term process.

Specific issues overall and for each parcel are below:

Overall

- Include 3 sites already restored on handout map, include existing federal, state, and TNC lands within levee
- Bank protection/flood control concerns are an issue for every site
- Include primary and secondary economic impact (including benefits) of restoration on each property (separate costs and benefits); be transparent about assumptions
- Explore ability of each site to return to habitat on its own

Womble and Jensen

- What species targeting? Goal – replant in vegetation originally there – natural habitat to benefit whole range of species
- What kind of price? Range of \$2,500-\$5,000 per acre for planting, preparation and 3 years of maintenance.
- Ways to quantify benefits for certain focused species?
- Concerns for buffers along borders to protect adjoining landowners. Concern for property adjacent to Womble. Maybe keep Womble as row crops.
- How fast does area return to riparian on its own? Varies. What conditions determine successful restoration with minimal intervention? With Womble, include specific analysis.
- Concern: Levee very close to river here. Concern for flooding system implications.
- Womble adjacent to public road. Potential public access point. Evaluate access potential.
- Concern: Economic impacts. Ex. Removal of walnut trees. What impact on local economy? Evaluate with all properties. (primary and secondary impacts)

1000 Acre Ranch and Stegeman

- With baseline on Stegeman, include historical description of walnuts taken out of production

- 1000-Acre Ranch – consider 15-20 acres south of ag easement as parking area – access? – close to highway
- Walnut orchard to south relatively new; prune trees older
- Concern – Buffer to protect ag production to south (esp. with young orchards, concern re: deer, rodents, etc.)
- Maybe leave Stegeman in walnuts to attract rodents that direction but this action raises coddling moth and rodent population concerns

Public Comment:

Dee Ohliger, property owner within levy and adjacent land, had concern for flood control and the affect on farmer's crops, pesticides, water usage, and animals attracted to the newly created area (i.e., squirrel population). She also expressed the need for dredging the river and the impact sediment has on river flow. Jeff reported property boundary issues will be discussed at TAC meeting tomorrow.

Overview of Upcoming Public Engagement Events:

Several upcoming public engagement events were discussed - a January newsletter to be sent out by Burt's office, a February public meeting, and a March workshop. The bullet points below indicate the AW discussion.

January Newsletter	February Public Meeting	March Workshop
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Audience?</u> Inner Levee Prop. Owners Adjoining Media AW - <u>Length?</u> 3-Fold brochure - Put summary in newspaper - Include owners, operators, agents - Survey results will expand mailing list for future newsletters (make explicit in survey?) - Out end of January - Draft circulated to AW - Include properties and maps - Posted on SRCAF website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AW meeting February 7 - Reminder in SRCAF newsletter - Evening - Dates: Feb. 16, 17, 23, or 24? - City council meets on Tuesdays - Farm Bureau on 1 Monday - Wednesday or Thursday? - Location: Colusa Community Center? - High school? - Topics include: Timeline Project overview Comments, questions, concerns - Handouts and visuals include: Contact list for AW List of properties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All day or ½-day - Timing - Later in March? - Revisit in February - Prior restored sites? - Natural recruitment sites? - Transportation

	Maps	
--	------	--

Potential AW Study Topics/Recommendations:

The AW keeps a parking lot list of potential study topics and recommendations that arise in conversation. Items for this list that arose at this meeting are:

- Study whether assessment of habitat and species on public land can be accurately extrapolated to private lands so that bigger picture is achieved while also protecting privacy and property rights
- Geomorphology assessment – subreach-wide
- Quantitative/Qualitative species analysis
- How quickly sites will return to riparian on their own? What conditions dictate successful restoration with minimal intervention?
- Long-term damming effects of habitat restoration on flooding

February Agenda and Next Steps:

- Next AW meeting - February 7; 10am – 2pm; Farm Bureau
- Carolyn revises December summary. To SRCAF for distribution before February meeting.
- Draft newsletter out. Tight timeline for comments. By Gregg/Burt around 1/15
- Public meeting – Date confirmed to AW ASAP by Burt/Gregg (Note: Determined to be Thursday, February 17 at the Casino.)
- February agenda: (*Indicates AW priority)
 - Summary of boat ramp study results
 - Gregg clarifies resources for studies AW directs
 - *Overview of state of data on T&E species in this subreach (gaps, etc.)
 - Include update of SRCAF GIS
 - *Remaining 4 restoration sites
 - March Workshop
 - *Subreach background report and cultural resources report